

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Official Action mailed **25 August 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-10, 13-22, and 25-33. Claims 1-5, 9, 13-17, 21, and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda et al. (USPN 6,424,992, hereinafter “Devarakonda”) in view of Kunzelman et al. (USPN 6,041,357, hereinafter “Kunzelman”) in further view of Davis et al. (USPN 6,367,009, hereinafter “Davis”) in further view of Haller et al (USPN 6,363,363 hereinafter “Haller”) and in further view of Davis et al. (USPN 6,282,522 hereinafter “Davis, V”). Claims 6, 7, 10, 18, 19, 22, 30, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda, Kunzelman, Davis, Haller and Davis, V, and further in view of Fielder et al. (USPN 6,105,133, hereinafter “Fielder”). Claims 8, 20, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda, Kunzelman, Davis, Haller and Davis, V, and in further view of Kennedy et al. (USPN 6,134,582, hereinafter “Kennedy”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected as being unpatentable over Devarakonda, Kunzelman, Davis, Haller, and Davis, V. Applicant respectfully points out that Devarakonda teaches **assigning a client** to a TCP router within the multi-node cluster and **directing all communication** to the multi-node cluster through the TCP router (see Devarakonda col. 4, lines 41-48; col. 6, lines 38-43). The invention of Devarakonda then routes a SSL connection **to the same node** within the multi-node cluster which the client used previously (see Devarakonda col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 12).

Kunzelman teaches **a client requesting a session token** from a first server and passing the session token to a second server in order to migrate a session from

the first server to the second server (see Kunzelman col. 2, lines 30-54; col. 3, lines 28-31).

Davis, teaches **a middle-tier server forwarding a security certificate** received from the client to an end-tier server (see Davis col. 4, line 43 to col. 5, line 40).

In contrast, the present invention shares a single secure communication session between multiple servers, wherein **the first server attempts to retrieve state information** associated with the session identifier for an active secure communication session between the client and a second server (see page 13, lines 1-8 of the instant application). The first server then uses this state information to establish a secure communication session with the client *without having to go through the time-consuming process of setting up a new secure communication session* (see page 9, lines 15-18; page 13, lines 12-13 of the instant application).

This is beneficial because (1) the client directly accesses the server with which it wants to establish a secure communication session without having to be routed through a central server, and (2) the client does not need to request a session token from the second server before establishing a connection with the first server. Furthermore, the process of transferring an active secure communication session from the second server to the first server is handled by the two servers, thereby making the process transparent to the client.

There is nothing within the combined system of Devarakonda, Kunzelman, Davis, Haller, and Davis, V, either separately or in concert, which suggests sharing a single secure communication session between multiple servers, wherein **the first server attempts to retrieve state information** associated with the session identifier for an active secure communication session between the client and a second server.

Accordingly, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to clarify that the present invention shares a single secure communication session

between multiple servers, wherein the first server attempts to retrieve state information associated with the session identifier for an active secure communication session between the client and a second server. These amendments find support on page 9, lines 15-18; page 13, lines 1-8; and page 13, lines 12-13 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-22, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-33, which depend upon claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Reg. No. 47,615

Date: 11 October 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
edward@parklegal.com